

9

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated September 13, 2004. Applicants have amended Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11 and added new Claims 22-28. Reconsideration of the claims, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Correction of the specification was required in that a new Abstract was requested. A new Abstract conforming with the recited rules has been added to the specification.

Claims 3, 5, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended these claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5, 11 and 17 were objected to for various informalities. The Applicants have amended these claims, where necessary, to overcome the informalities recited by the Official Action. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hanson et al.* in view of *Jacobs et al.* Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more particularly indicate how the method includes the steps of enabling the first user to modify a graphical user interface component in a first location, extract a data object from said graphical user interface component and then create a message in a first format containing said data object. Upon receipt at a second user, recreating the data object from said message in said first format and then generating the modified graphical user interface component at the second user from said object. Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are disclosed by neither of the *Hanson et al.* or *Jacobs et al.* references.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

S/N 09/871,861

Atty. Dkt. No. NEXU-26,962

The *Hanson et al.* reference describes no manner for modifying a graphical user interface, extracting a data object from said modified graphical user interface, and then creating a message in a first format containing said object wherein said message is sent to a second user that recreates the data object and then generates the modified graphical user interface from the object. The *Jacobs et al.* reference describes the manner in which multiple users may modify HTML documents to replace HTML data types with applets which offer cooperative functionalities. (See 3.1.2). This is distinctly different from the process now described with respect to Claim 1 which includes the steps of enabling the first user to modify a graphical user interface component, extract a data object from said modified graphical user interface component and create a message in a first format containing said data object; and at a second user, recreate the data object from the message in said first format and generate the modified graphical user interface component from said data object. Therefore, we respectfully submit that Claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, are distinguishable from the combination of the *Hanson et al.* and *Jacob et al.* references, and a Notice of Allowance for Claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 describe the operations occurring at the first user and the second user, respectively. Claim 2 includes the steps of extracting a data object from a modified graphical user interface component and creating a message in a first format containing said data object. Likewise, Claim 3 includes the step of recreating the data object from said message in said first format and generating the modified graphical user interface component from said data object. These limitations, being similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 1, distinguish Claims 2 and 3 from the combination of *Hanson et al.* and *Jacobs et al.* for similar reasons. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 and 3, and all claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the cited references and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants have additionally added Claims 22-28. Claim 22 includes limitations similar to those of original Claim 1 and further includes the step of organizing the message in one or more of a plurality of categories. The Applicants respectfully submit that the organization of a message into one or more of a plurality of categories is described by neither the *Hanson et al.* nor the *Jacob et al.* references.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/871,861
Atty. Dkt. No. NEXU-26,962

11

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22, and all claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the art of record.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/NEXU-26,962 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Brian D. Walker
Registration No. 37,751

BDW:keb

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
December 6, 2004

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/871,861
Atty. Dkt. No. NEXU-26,962